



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,729	07/15/2003	Emilio J.A. Roldan	3524.015	7038
30448	7590	10/02/2007	EXAMINER ISSAC, ROY P	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P.O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			ART UNIT 1623	PAPER NUMBER
		MAIL DATE 10/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/619,729	ROLDAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Roy P. Issac	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 32,33,35-37,39-45 and 47-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 47-53 and 55-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 32, 39-41, 44, 45, 54 and 58-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 20 July, 2007 has been entered.

### ***Status of the Application***

Claims 32, 39-41, 44, 45 and 54 have been amended. Claims 32-33, 35-37, 39-45 and 47-62 are currently pending, of which claims 47-53 and 55-57 are withdrawn from consideration. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in prior office actions.

### **Rejections Withdrawn**

In view of the cancellation of claims 34, 38 and 46, all rejections made with respect to claims 34, 38 and 46 in the previous office action are withdrawn.

Applicants' amendment deleting the recitation "prevention" in claims 38-39 and 54 overcomes the rejection made in the previous office action of claims 38-39 and 54 under section 112, first paragrphah.

Applicants' amendment deleting the recitation "recently" in reference to rejection under section 112, second paragraph in claim 40 overcomes the rejection made in the previous office action of claim 40 under section 112, second paragraph.

Applicants' amendment deleting the recitation "after the administration to the patient – the 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid, or any of its soluble salts or any of its hydrates are present at extracellular concentration in a range of between  $10^{-6}M$  and  $10^{-10}M$ " in claims 44-46 overcomes the rejection made in the previous office action of claims 44-46 under section 112, second paragraph.

Applicants' amendment inserting the recitation "a patient without an osteopathy" overcomes the rejection of claims 32, 35, 41and 54 over Van Beek et. al.

The following are new grounds of rejections:

***Claim Objections***

Claim 39 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 32 from which claim 39 depends recites administering NH<sub>2</sub>-OPD to patients without osteopathy. Claim 39 is directed to patients with osteopathy selected from the group comprising osteoporosis, Paget's disease, arthritis, peridental osteoperia etc. As such, claim 39 is not considered to be further limiting claim 32.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 32-33, 35-37, 39 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The instant claims are drawn to the method for maintaining a healthy bone structure by administration of a bisphosphonic compound to a patient without an osteopathy. The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

(1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Nature of the invention:

The invention herein is related to a method of maintaining a healthy bone structure comprising administering to a patient without an osteopathy a medicament comprising NH2-OPD. Note that, "maintaining a healthy bone structure" in a "patient without an osteopathy" would require the patient not to develop any osteopathies. This is considered a preventive method.

The state of the prior art:

The prior art includes the use of NH2-OPD for the treatment of a variety of diseases including urolithiasis (kidney stones etc.), ectopic calcifications, osteoporosis, arthritis and periodontal diseases. (WO 97/02827; Of Record). The prior art does not show the administration of NH2-OPD to a patient without an osteopathy. Osteopathy is considered any type of bone disease or disorder of any condition effecting bones. The prior art does not show how to identify a patient without any bone disease, disorder or any condition effecting bones. For example, osteoporosis is often diagnosed in patients by scanning bone mineral densitometry methodologies and developing T-Score for risk population. (Miller PD, Rev. Endocr. Metab. Disord. 2006, 7, 75-89; PTO-892). The T-Score sets an intervention threshold for treatment of osteoporosis. However, many patients would develop fractures even though they are not in the osteoporosis risk profile. (Pages 75-56). Miller discusses the various parameters in determining T-Score and its utility in predicting osteoporosis. The fracture risk varies for different parts of the body as well as between patient population, ethnicity, race and gender.

The claims herein are directed to treatment of a "patient without an osteopathy". This recitation is interpreted as a patient without any osteopathies. The existing methodology cannot identify with certainty patients that are at risk for osteoporosis. Osteopathy is a much broader term than osteoporosis, and includes any type of bone disorders, diseases and conditions effecting bones. It is highly unlikely that the administration of NH2-OPD can maintain the bone structure without any types of osteopathies from developing. One of skill in the art would consider it likely that the administration of NH2-OPD to a patient without any osteopathies would result in the formation of bone spurs, calcifications etc. Concentration of mineral in bone is partially controlled by the activities of tow classes of cell: osteoclast cells and osteoblast cells. Osteoblast cells function in the formation of bone while osteoclast cells function in the destruction or "resorption" of bone. As applicants admits, (See Paragraph 2, Page 21, response filed 7/20/2007) that, in healthy persons there is a balance between the activity of osteoclast and osteoblast cells that maintain a sufficient level of bone strength while preventing the formation of unhealthy "overgrown" bone structures. One of skill in the art would view the administration of NH2-OPD to healthy patients to change the balance between osteobalst/ osteoclast activity and thus, resulting in a variance from the maintenance of the osteopathy-free condition.

The relative skill of those in the art:

The relative skill of those in the art is high, with a typical practitioner having obtained a PhD, M.S. or equivalent advanced degree.

The predictability or lack thereof in the art: the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

Maintaining healthy bone structure is not the same as the treatment of a disease condition associated with bone structure. In order to maintain healthy bone structure by preventing a disease, as opposed to merely delaying or reducing its symptoms, a treatment must either render the subject completely resistant to said disease after a single treatment or a limited number of treatments, or else, when continued indefinitely, continue to completely suppress the occurrence of said disease. In order to practice a preventative method, one of skill in the art must know the answer to several questions in addition to the effectiveness of the therapy in short-term relief of symptoms, including:

- 1) What is the duration of a single course of therapy? How often must the therapy be administered to completely suppress the disease?
- 2) Does the subject develop tolerance to the therapy over time? Does the disease eventually progress to a point where the therapy is unable to completely suppress all symptoms?
- 3) What are the long-term effects of the therapy? Does it cause progressive damage to the kidneys, liver, or other organs? Does the active agent accumulate in the subject's tissues? Is the minimum dose necessary to completely prevent the disease safe for long-term administration? Are there any steps that can be taken to reduce side effects?

For this reason, many of the therapies that are useful for treating a disease are not useful preventing the disease, which would be required to maintain a healthy bone

Art Unit: 1623

structure. For example, antibiotics, chemotherapeutics and antiviral drugs are not normally administered to healthy subjects in order to prevent the development of infection or cancer. Thus, it is highly unlikely that any of the administration of healthy bone structure can be achieved by the administration of the compositions of the instant application.

The presence or absence of working examples:

The specification does not provide any examples of the administration of NH2-OPD to any patients. The specification does not provide any guidance for identifying a patient without any osteopathy. No examples of administration of NH2-OPD to a patient without an osteopathy is disclosed. There are no examples of maintenance of bone structure by a subject without any osteopathy due to the administration of NH2-OPD. The lack of working examples is a critical and crucial factor to be considered, especially in cases involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art. See MPEP § 2164.

The quantity of experimentation necessary:

There are no clear cut limitations on when a patient has an osteopathy versus when they don't. Many of the bone related diseases are progressive diseases, and most can only be diagnosed after they have multiple symptoms. Thus, how would a skilled artisan know when a patient has an osteopathy, versus when they are without an osteopathy? How is it determined? It is not clear which ones do applicant point to as representative of "a patient without an osteopathy"? Does a patient without an

osteopathy have NO clinical signs? OR, do they have some clinical signs, but are still considered "healthy" (i.e. no outward appearance of osteopathy).

In order to determine whether the claimed method can maintain a healthy bone structure, one of ordinary skill in the art will need to answer the questions posed above, which will require significant intellectual and financial input, and an effort that will be collaborative in nature with clinical physicians, organic chemists and biochemists involved, resulting in enormous burden on one of skill in the art to practice the invention as claimed.

Thus, the specification fails to provide clear and convincing evidence in sufficient support of the maintenance of healthy bone structure by administration to a patient without an osteopathy NH2-OPD.

*Genentech*, 108 F.3d at 1366, states that, "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors as discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 32-33, 35-37, 39-45, 54, and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants recite, "said method comprising administering to a patient without an osteopathy." There are no clear cut limitations on when a patient has an osteopathy versus when they don't. Many of the bone related diseases are progressive diseases, and most can only be diagnosed after they have multiple symptoms. Thus, how would a skilled artisan know when a patient has an osteopathy, versus when they are without an osteopathy? How is it determined? It is not clear which ones do applicant point to as representative of "a patient without an osteopathy"? Does a patient without an osteopathy have NO clinical signs? OR, do they have some clinical signs, but are still considered "healthy" (i.e. no outward appearance of osteopathy). As such, it is not clear how one would identify a patient without osteopathy and one of skill in the art would not be able to ascertain the metes and merits of the claims herein.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim recite the phrase, "post-treatment of osteopathies". It is not clear whether the claim require a patient to be free of osteopathies as a result of treatment of osteopathies or whether after some treatment for osteopathies is given. As

such, one of skill in the art would not be able ascertain the metes and bounds of the claim herein.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Beek et. al. (WO 97/02827; Of record).

Van Beek et. al. discloses the use of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid for the treatment of all forms of osteoporosis, arthritis and periodontal diseases, as well as diagnostic purposes. (Page 3, last paragraph to Page 4, line 2; Page 5, Paragraph 3). Beek et. al. discloses the use of said compound in combination with calcium salt, vitamin D and parathyroid hormone. (Page 4, Paragraph 2; Claims 5-10, Page 15). Beek et. al. further discloses that 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid is devoid of any antiresorptive activity. (Page 5, Paragraph 3, lines 1-5). 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid is disclosed as useful in the treatment of diseases in which antresorptive action is unwanted. . (Page 5, Paragraph 3, lines 5-10). Osteoporosis, arthritis and periodontal diseases are considered bone

disorders. Example 4 and Figure 1 shows binding of bone mineral by 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid as well as olpadronate at various concentrations. Example 5 and Figure 2 shows inhibition of calcium incorporation by 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid and similar compounds. Half maximal inhibition for 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid was disclosed as  $2 \times 10^{-7}$  M. (Page 11, last paragraph). Van Beek et. al. further discloses that 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid inhibited crystal growth with half maximal concentrations of  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  M. (Example 6, page 12). These concentrations are considered to fall in the claimed range of a "bone health promoting effective amount".

The following are new or modified rejections necessitated by Applicant's amendment filed 7/20/2007, wherein the limitations in pending claims 32, 39-41, 44, 45 and 54 as amended now have been changed, and claims 60-62 are newly submitted. The limitations in the amended claims have been changed and the breadth and scope of those claims have been changed. Therefore, rejections from the previous Office Action, mailed 4/23/2007, have been modified and are listed below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 1623

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 32-33, 35-37, 40-45, 54, and 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 32, from which claims 33-37 depend is directed to a method for maintaining a healthy bone structure. Applicant's amendment with respect to claim 32 herein has been fully considered, but is deemed to insert new matter into the claims since the specification as originally filed does not provide support for applicants' claim a composition comprising a "medicament comprising a bone health promoting effective amount of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid". The specification as filed provides support for a "*bone-health promoting amounts of a medicament*". The claims herein are directed to a "*bone health promoting effective amount of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid*". The scope of a bone health promoting medicament comprising said compound is different from the bone health promoting effective amount of said compound as claimed herein.

Similarly, claims 40-42 have been amended to recite "a medicament comprising a bone health promoting effective amount of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid. Claims 43-45 and 58-59 depend from claim 42. The scope of a bone health promoting effective amount of a medicament comprising said compound is different from the bone health promoting effective amount of said

Art Unit: 1623

compound as claimed herein. As such, applicant's amendment with respect to claim 40 herein has been fully considered, but is deemed to insert new matter into the claims since the specification as originally filed does not provide support for applicants' claim a composition comprising a "medicament comprising a bone health promoting effective amount of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid".

The description as originally filed does not provide support for the claims herein. Consequently, there is nothing within the instant specification which would lead the artisan in the field to believe that Applicant was in possession of the invention as it is now claimed. See *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ 2d 1111, CAFC 1991, see also *In re Winkhaus*, 188 USPQ 129, CCPA 1975.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that, a person having ordinary skill in the art of pharmacology understands that any pharmacologically active substance is only therapeutically effective in certain amounts and that the skilled artisan will understand from the specification that the disclosed beneficial effects of NH2-OPD will only occur at certain effective amounts. However, that principle can also be considered for a composition in which NH2-OPD is one of the components. As described above applicants' disclosure, as originally filed, provides support for a "bone-health promoting amounts of a medicament". Applicants point to a passage in which treatment of children who have recently undergone corticosteroid treatment for support for the claimed recitation herein, "*bone health promoting effective amount of 1-amino-3-(N,N-*

Art Unit: 1623

*dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid".* However, the cited passage does not mention a bone-health promoting effective amount of NH2-OPD. The prior art discloses multiple uses for NH2-OPD including its use as a carrier. The disclosure herein shows various properties of multiple drugs such as pamidronate, olpadronate and etidronate. As such, there is no reason for one of skill in the art to assume that the "bone-health promoting effective amount" is entirely due to NH2-OPD.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-45 and 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Beek et. al. (WO 97/02827; Of record) in view of Brumsen et. al. (Reviews in Molecular Medicine, 76(4), 1997, pp266-283; Of Record).

Van Beek et. al. discloses the use of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid for the treatment of all forms of osteoporosis, arthritis and periodontal diseases, as well as diagnostic purposes. (Page 3, last paragraph to Page 4, line 2; Page 5, Paragraph 3). Beek et. al. discloses the use of said compound in combination with calcium salt, vitamin D and parathyroid hormone. (Page 4, Paragraph 2; Claims 5-10, Page 15). Beek et. al. further discloses that 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid is devoid of any

antiresorptive activity. (Page 5, Paragraph 3, lines 1-5). 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid is disclosed as useful in the treatment of diseases in which antresorptive action is unwanted. . (Page 5, Paragraph 3, lines 5-10). Since the treatment of all forms of osteoporosis and arthritis and periodontal diseases is required "for maintaining a healthy bone structure", said treatment is considered encompassed by the "method for maintaining a healthy bone structure". Example 4 and Figure 1 shows binding of bone mineral by 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid as well as olpadronate at various concnetrations. Example 5 and Figure 2 shows inhibition of calcium incorporation by 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid and similar compounds. Half maximal inhibition for 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid was disclosed as  $2 \times 10^{-7}$  M. (Page 11, last paragraph). Van Beek et. al. further discloses that 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid inhibited crystal growth with half maximal concentrations of  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  M. (Example 6, page 12). These concentrations are considered to fall in the claimed range of a "bone health promoting effective amount". Furthermore, Beek et. al. discloses that in comparison with olpadronate, 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid has similar binding activity (Figure 1) while without the undesired antiresorptive activity. (Figure 7; Page 5, Paragraph 3, lines 1-5).

Beek et. al. does not expressly disclose the use of NH<sub>2</sub>-OPD for administration to healthy patients or patients without osteopathies to human being at or above the age

of 40 years or to a child or for patients who have undergone corticosteroid treatment or for combating bone disease in a child or any particular dosage range.

Brumsen et. al. discloses the use of 1-hydroxy-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonate (olpadronate), a molecule with strong structural similarity to 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid. Note that the only difference between the two compounds is the substitution of the hydroxyl group for the amine group at 1-position. Brumsen et. al discloses that long term olpadronate administration to children severe osteoporosis was devoid of any adverse effect on the growing skeleton. (Web printout; Page 20, Paragraph 2). Brumsen et. al. discloses the use of bisphosphonates for patients who underwent glucocorticoid treatment. (Web printout; Page 21, Paragraph 1). Brumsen et. al further discloses that bisphosphonates are well known for treatment for patients with postmenopausal osteoporosis, a condition generally affecting those above 40 years age.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid to treat children in place of olpadronate because Brumsen et. al. discloses olpadronate for the treatment of children and Beek et. al. discloses 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid to have superior antiresorptive activity (i.e. lacking the undesired antiresorptive activity) in direct comparison with olpadronate. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to treat healthy patients, and patients without osteopathies with 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid

because it is devoid of any unwanted antiresorptive activity and beneficial effects.

Furthermore, Beek's disclosed use for diagnostic purposes is expected to include healthy individuals as well as individuals without osteopathies. Furthermore, it is considered to be within the basic skills of one of ordinary skill in the art to select appropriate dosage levels for one of various diseases considered as bone disorders. It has been held that it is within the skill in the art to select optimal parameters, such as amounts of ingredients, in a composition in order to achieve a beneficial effect. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). All the claimed steps herein are known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp and results of such efforts is considered common sense, rather than a product of innovation.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected that the use of 1-amino-3-(N,N-dimethylamino)-propylidene-1,1-bisphosphonic acid as claimed herein would be successful because Beek et.al. showed in comparison with olpadronate, the compound of the instant application has similar or better effects.

Thus the invention as a whole is clearly *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that, "because it is anti-resorptive activity of bisphosphonates that was previously believed to be useful in treatment and prevention of bone disease, it was not obvious to use NH2-OPD for the same purposes as olpadronate." However, it was known in the prior art that NH2-OPD lacked anti-resorptive property. (See rejection above; Van Beek et. al.). Van Beek further compared olpadronate with NH2-OPD and found many of NH2-OPD's qualities to be comparable to olpadronate. As such applicants' argument was found unpersuasive. Applicants further argue that NH2-OPD's ability to exert an effect on the osteoblast cells was not known prior to the invention. However, the claims herein are directed to the treatment of bone disorders including osteoporosis which was explicitly taught by Van Beek et. al. Applicants' further argue that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Van Beek with Brumsen. However, the court in *KSR v. Teleflex* foreclosed the argument that a specific teaching suggestion or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. (See the recent Board decision *Ex Parte Smith*, Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007; Citing *KSR v. Teleflex*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396). Applicants' further argue that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have expected NH2-OPD to have therapeutic value due to the lack of anti-resorptive activity. However, Van Beek et. al. clearly recognized NH2-OPD's lack of anti-resorptive value and still disclosed its usefulness for the treatment of bone disorders such as, osteoporosis, arthritis and periodontal diseases. (See rejection above). As such, applicants' argument that one of

ordinary skill in the art would not expect NH2-OPD to not have therapeutic effectiveness was found unpersuasive. The rejection under section 103(a) is still deemed proper and is adhered to.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy P. Issac whose telephone number is 571-272-2674. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Anna Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roy P. Issac  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623

  
S. Anna Jiang, Ph.D.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623